

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Amendments, Drawing, and Objection

The specification has been amended to add the reference numeral "111" in the disclosure of the spring shown in Fig. 1.

Claim 5 has been amended to obviate the objection.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite the color filter behind the lens, as shown in Fig. 3C.

No new matter is presented.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

I. The rejection of claims 1-4 as anticipated by Hopkins (*et al.*) is respectfully traversed. Hopkins discloses a device for aligning headlamps that attaches to the front of the headlamp; the spring 208 provides a bias force essentially allowing the tool to be detached from the front of the headlamp after the suction force holding the lamp is released (e.g., col. 1, first paragraph). Claim 1 specifically requires a frame attached behind the headlamp. Fig. 1 of Hopkins clearly shows the device attached to the front, outside surface of the headlamp. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. The rejection of claims 5-9 as anticipated by Gaus is respectfully traversed in light of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks. Claim 5 now specifically recites the lamp as a dual headlamp and emergency lamp and, as shown in Fig. 2, the lamp and the battery each has a connection to the vehicle's electrical system, and the battery has a separate connection to the lamp. Gaus does disclose an accessory lamp for use in various vehicles, but does not disclose the lamp as a headlight, nor does Gaus disclose that the lamp has a

separate connection to the vehicle's electrical system in addition to that from the battery. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

III. The rejection of claims 10-14 as anticipated by Dunn is respectfully traversed in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claim 10 has been amended to recite the color changing device as disposed behind the lens. Dunn discloses a device for illuminating a water-borne craft by using side-emitting optical fibers (top of column five) so that the entire length of the fiber is illuminated. Contrary to the statement in the rejection, there is no disclosure of a lens in the Dunn disclosure. Even if the output lamp (64) is considered to have a lens, the color wheel is in front of that lens, as opposed to being disposed behind the lens as in claim 10. Dunn has no need of a lens because his intention is to provide a lighting trim to the craft, not to have a beam of directed light. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.